

LABOUR DEPARTMENT

The 6th May, 1977

No. 3938-4Lab-77/11008.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Hindustan Pottery Industries, Bahadurgarh.

BEFORE SHRI MOHAN LAL JAIN, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA,
ROHTAK

Reference No. 87 of 1975

between

SHRI RAM CHANDER, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S HINDUSTAN
POTTERY INDUSTRIES, BAHADURGARH

AWARD

By order No. ID/RK/244-F-75/54213—17, dated 4th August, 1975, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Hindustan Pottery Industries, Bahadurgarh, and its workman Shri Ram Chander to this Court, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Ram Chander was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

The parties put in their appearance in this Court in response to the usual notices of reference sent to them and filed their pleadings.

The workman alleged,—*vide* claim statement filed by him in conformity with the notice of demand, dated 3rd February, 1975, served by him on the management that he was not allowed to work in the factory on 10th October, 1974, by the management without his being responsible for any lapse in his duties on his part and that his services had thus been terminated illegally in that manner and he was entitled to reinstatement with continuity of service and full back wages. He stated that he was not even charged properly and that the registered envelope sent to one Ram Chander, son of Shri Juggi, c/o Nihal Bhavan, Jhajjar Road, Bahadurgarh, allegedly containing a charge-sheet against him (Ram Chander, son of Shri Ram Subhag) in fact did not contain any letter or charge-sheet and was on the other hand found blank. He thus set up a case that his services were terminated without serving him any charge-sheet or without any enquiry being held against him according to law.

The management denied the allegations of the workman,—*vide* written statement filed by them and pleaded that the latter having been duly charged for his having made an attempt along with one Mewa Lal to molest one Smt. Meera Devi, a co-workman, on 30th September, 1974, during duty hours when she was taking bricks to the kiln at about 11-00 a. m. and for his having beaten her husband Shri Mishri Lal on his intervening to free her from their clutches, the charges were duly proved in a domestic enquiry held against him and his services were thus rightly terminated on proof of the misconduct committed by him.

The following issues was thus framed by me,—*vide* my order, dated 24th February, 1975, in terms of the dispute referred to this Court :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Ram Chander was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

I have carefully gone through the written arguments filed by the parties and the evidence led by them. I propose to decide the issue as under :—

The management in order to prove the issue stated above, examined Shri Madan Lal one of their partner MW-1, Shri Tikka Ram their Watchman MW-2, Shri Tara Chand their supervisor MW-3 and Shri Harish Chander, Enquiry Officer. Shri Madan Lal deposed that he received a complaint from Meera Devi on 20th September, 1974, about the workmen Sarvshri Ram Chander and Mewa Lal having attempted to molest her on 20th September, 1974 and he having called them asked for their explanation and let them go unpunished with a warning not to misbehave in that manner in future. He added that he again received a complaint against Ram Chander and Mewa Lal, workmen, from Smt. Meera Devi on 30th September, 1974, in writing and drew up a charge-sheet, dated 7th October, 1974, copy Exhibit -M1 and delivered it to Shri Teeka Ram watchman for its delivery to Shri Ram Chander and that Shri Teeka Ram made a report Exhibit M-1/A duly

attested by Tara Chand,—*vide* his signatures Exhibit M-1/B that the workman Shri Ram Chander refused to receive the same. He further gave out that he even sent the Charge Sheet through registered post on 8th October, 1976 and received acknowledgement Exhibit M-2 and that no reply in writing was received from the workman concerned with the result that he appointed Shri Harish Chander as an Enquiry Officer who made an enquiry and submitted his report Exhibit M-6 holding the charges proved and on consideration of the same the services of the workman were terminated,—*vide* letter Exhibit M-7. He continued to say that an objection being taken by Shri Ram Chander workman concerned that he did not get full opportunity to defend himself before the Enquiry Officer. He was intimidated,—*vide* letter Exhibit M-8 to submit his explanation and that he failed to do so.

Shri Teeka Ram corroborated the evidence of Shri Madan Lal while stating that he personally wanted to deliver the Charge Sheet Exhibit M-1 to the workman concerned and that the latter refused to receive it in the presence of Shri Tara Chand with the result that he made his report Exhibit M-1/A under his signatures and got it attested from Shri Tara Chand. Shri Tara Chand supported the statement of Shri Teeka Ram. It would thus appear that the case put forth by the workman that the Charge Sheet was never received by him stands belied by the testimony of Sarvshri Madan Lal, Teeka Ram and Tara Chand none of whom had any axe to grind against him. Authorised representative for the workman wanted to make a capital out of the acknowledgement receipt bearing the address Shri Ram Chander, son of Shri Juggi c/o Nihal Bhavan, Jhajjar Road, Bahadurgarh and subsequently corrected as Shri TRam Chand, son of Ram Subhag, the workman concerned and contended that the registered envelope allegedly containing the Charge Sheet was in fact sent to Shri Ram Chander, son of Shri Juggi and not to Shri Ram Chander, son of Shri Ram Subhag the concerned workman and that the alteration in the address on acknowledgement receipt Exhibit M-2 was made subsequently. I have given this matter my careful consideration.

Shri Madan Lal deposed that Shri Ram Chander, son of Shri Juggi had in fact resigned his job on 5th October, 1974 and was no longer in their service thereafter. This part of the statement remained un rebutted and even Ram Chander, son of Juggi examined as WW-3 did not controvert the same. It would thus appear that there was under the circumstances no question of the management sending the Charge Sheet to Shri Ram Chander, son of Shri Juggi. They could have on the other hand sent the Charge Sheet only to the workman concerned Shri Ram Chander, son of Shri Ram Subhag.

Shri Harish Chander appearing as MW-4 gave out that he sent letter Exhibit M-11 to the workman concerned asking him to appear before him on 21st October, 1974, through registered post and that on his (workman) failure to appear before him on 21st October, 1974 the date fixed in the enquiry or to send any reply, he (Enquiry Officer) again sent letter, dated 23rd October, 1974 copy Exhibit M-13 through registered post directing him to appear before him on 2nd November, 1974. The management actually brought on record the postal receipt Exhibit M-12 of the letter Exhibit M-11, dated 15th October, 1974 and the postal receipt Exhibit M-14 and the acknowledgement receipt Exhibit M-15 bearing the address Shri Ram Chander c/o Nihal Bhavan, Jhajjar Road, Bahadurgarh and duly signed on his behalf by Shri Dhan Singh his duly authorised representative. The workman failed to appear before the Enquiry Officer despite being repeatedly asked to do so with the result that he was proceeded with *ex-parte* and the Enquiry Officer gave his findings copy Exhibit M-18 holding the charges proved against him.

In view of the acknowledgement receipt Exhibit M-15 being signed by Shri Dhan Singh who appeared as authorised representative of Shri Ram Chander, son of Ram Subhag workman concerned in this Court, it cannot be said that the latter remained ignorant of the proceedings of the enquiry and the Charge Sheet framed against him, even if it were assumed that the statements of Shri Teeka Ram and Tara Chand referred to above were false. Considered from any angle the workman concerned Shri Ram Chander, son of Shri Ram Subhag is proved to have been served with the Charge Sheet and the notices of the enquiry through registered post through his authorised representative Shri Dhan Singh and it would be too late in the day to say that he never received the Charge Sheet or the notices of the enquiry.

The management took extra care to grant one more opportunity to the workman to explain his conduct,—*vide* their letter, dated 27th/30th November, 1974 admittedly received by him directing him to appear before them on 7th December, 1974 and informing him that on their failure to do so he shall be deemed to have nothing to submit. The workman admittedly did not avail this opportunity. It is thus crystal clear that the workman is proved to have declined to receive the Charge Sheet sought to be delivered to him by Shri Teeka Ram and is further proved to have actually received the same through his authorised representative Shri Dhan Singh *vide* acknowledgement receipt Exhibit M-2 and the notices of the enquiry,—*vide* acknowledgement receipt M-15. He is further proved to have received letter copy Exhibit M-3 intimating him the appointment of the Enquiry Officer,—*vide* acknowledgement receipt Exhibit M-4. All these letters purport to have been sent to him on his address Ram Chander c/o Nihal Bhavan, Jhajjar Road, Bahadurgarh.

The oral evidence of Shri Mewa Lal WW-1 that he did not find the Enquiry Officer on his going in the premises of the management on 2nd November, 1974, and the oral statement of Shri Ram Chander, son of Juggi that he had received a registered envelope not containing any letter and the statement of Shri Ram Chander, son of Ram Subhag WW-2 that he did not receive any Charge Sheet or any letter from the Enquiry Officer are thus all unreliable and hereby rejected as false.

I have carefully seen the proceedings of the enquiry M-17 taken up by Shri Harish Chander and his report Exhibit M-18. I am satisfied that the workman failed to appear before the Enquiry Officer despite being duly informed of the date of hearing fixed by the Enquiry Officer twice and the order of taking proceedings against him *ex parte* was just. The findings of the Enquiry Officer are well borne out by the evidence led before him and taken from any angle no fault can be found either with the proceedings of the enquiry or the report of the Enquiry Officer. The result is that the orders of termination of services of the workman concerned are justified and he is not entitled to any relief. I accordingly decide the issue in favour of the management and return the award with these findings.

The 14th April, 1977.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

No. 756, dated the 20th April, 1977

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

No. 3244-4Lab-77/11010.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Hari Palace, Ambala City.

BEFORE SHRI MOHAN LAL JAIN, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,
HARYANA, ROHTAK

Reference No. 6 of 1976

between

SHRI WALAITI RAM, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. HARI PALACE,
AMBALA CITY
AWARD

By order No. ID/AMB/240-A-75/3087, dated 23rd January, 1976 of the Governor of Haryana, the following dispute between the management of M/s Hari Palace, Ambala City and its workman Shri Walaiti Ram, was referred to this Court, for adjudication in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

“Whether the termination of services of Shri Walaiti Ram was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

The parties put in their appearance in this Court in response to the usual notices of reference sent to them and filed their pleadings. The workman alleged in conformity with the notice of demand served by him on the management,—*vide* claim statement filed by him that his services had been terminated by the management with effect from 18th October, 1975 illegally without holding an enquiry and without sufficient ground and that he was entitled to reinstatement with continuity of service and full back wages.

The management denied the allegations of the workman,—*vide* written statement filed by them and pleaded that the latter resigned his job voluntarily, of his own accord on 18th October, 1975 and that his resignation was accepted the same day at the spot, and that he had attained the age of superannuation and was not entitled to any relief on that ground as well.

The following issues were thus framed by me on pleas of the parties,—*vide* order dated 10th May, 1976:—

1. Whether the workman resigned his job voluntarily on 18th October, 1975 and his resignation was duly accepted by the management ?
2. If not, whether the termination of services of Shri Walaiti Ram was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

I have heard learned authorised representatives for the parties with reference to the evidence led by them. I decide the issues as under :—

Issue No. 1:

The management examined Shri Kuldip Parkash one of their managing partners, MW-1 and Shri Harbans Lal Rana, Manager, Hari Palace Cinema, MW-2, in support of their plea that the workman submitted his resignation, Exhibit M-1. Shri Kuldip Parkash deposed that the workman concerned Shri Walaiti Ram came to him on 18th October, 1975, in his office and submitted his resignation, Exhibit M-1, on the ground that he had become old and he was unable to do his duties and that he (Shri Kuldip Parkash) accepted this resignation,—*vide* endorsement Exhibit M-1/A and conveyed to him (workman) the acceptance of the resignation. He added that the workman received Rs. 247 in his presence,—*vide*, Vr. Exhibit M-2 in full and final settlement of all his claims, in the presence of Shri Harbans Lal Rana, Manager, at the time of submission of the resignation. Shri Harbans Lal corroborated the statement of Shri Kuldip Parkash while stating that the resignation Exhibit M-1 was submitted by the workman and accepted by Kuldip Parkash in his presence on 18th October, 1975, and that the former received a sum of Rs 247 on 19th October, 1975, in full and final settlement of all his accounts,—*vide* Vr. Exhibit M-2 in his presence.

This is all the evidence led by the management in support of their plea. Shri Walaiti Ram, the workman concerned, denied the plea of the management and controverted the evidence of Shri Kuldip Parkash and Harbans Lal,—*vide* his statement made by him as his own witness and examined one Shri Suresj Pal in support of his allegations that Shri Harbans Lal Rana asked him (workman) to go out of the Cinema as his services had been terminated by Shri Kuldip Parkash. I have carefully considered the evidence led by the parties and seen the resignation, Exhibit M-1 and the Vr., Exhibit M-2.

No reply of the notice of demand copy Exhibit M-3 admittedly received by the management was proved to have been sent to the workman concerned. Shri Harbans Lal Rana on the other hand admitted that he did not know if any reply was sent to the workman of this notice of demand and he did not know about the proceedings taken by the Conciliation Officer. The thumb-impression appearing on the resignation, Exhibit M-1, is blurred and there is smudging of ink below the writing relating to the resignation. It was admitted both by Shri Kuldip Parkash and Shri Harbans Lal Rana that the workman did not put his thumb-impression on the resignation, Exhibit M-1, in his presence. Each one of them again admitted that he did not know the name of the scribe of the resignation. Two broad facts thus emerge out of the evidence of Shri Kuldip Parkash and Shri Harbans Lal Rana, firstly that the resignation, Exhibit M-1, is not proved to have been written either on the dictation or the instance of the workman and secondly blurred thumb-impression of the resignation, Exhibit M-1, is not proved to have been put by the workman himself. The management did not care to get the thumb-impression appearing on the resignation, Exhibit M-1, compared from the admitted or proved thumb-impression of the workman. Shri Walaiti Ram, workman, is admittedly illiterate and does not know writing or reading Hindi script or English script. There was under the circumstances heavy burden on the management to prove that the resignation, Exhibit M-1, was written at his instance and duly thumb-marked by him after full knowledge of its contents. The management has in my opinion failed to discharge this burden and the oral statements of Shri Kuldip Parkash and Harbans Lal Rana broadly made by them that Shri Walaiti Ram, workman, brought the resignation, Exhibit M-1, already written and thumb-marked by him before Shri Kuldip Parkash cannot be relied upon under the circumstances of the case stated above. Particularly when the resignation, Exhibit M-1, is not proved either to have been written on the dictation and at the instance of the workman or thumb-marked by him and their evidence stands rebutted by the testimony of Shri Walaiti Ram himself that he never thumb-marked any resignation. I, as such decline to place any reliance on the testimony of Shri Kuldip Parkash and Harbans Lal Rana and hold that the resignation, Exhibit M-1, is not proved to be a genuine document.

Coming now to the plea of payment of sum of Rs. 247 to the workman,—*vide* Vr., Exhibit M-3, in full and final settlement of all his claims, the Vr. was admittedly signed by Shri Harbans Lal Rana, MW-1, himself. No evidence was led to establish the name of the person who actually scribed it. It is significant to note the denial of Shri Harbans Lal Rana, Manager, of his knowledge if there was corresponding entry relating to this payment in the Cash Book or not. No reply of the notice of demand was proved to have been sent to the workman. All these facts lead to a presumption against the management that the plea in respect of the payment of Rs. 247 to the workman is false and fabricated. It was not explained as to why a corresponding entry in the Cash Book was not made and the Cash Book was not produced in order to prove the payment if such entry was made therein. I, therefore, hold that the Vr., Exhibit M-2, has not been established to have been thumb-marked by the workman with full knowledge of its contents. I, thus for all the reasons stated above hold and decide this issue against the management.

Issue No. 2:

In view of my findings on issue No. 1, the termination of services of the workman by the management is obviously unjustified and not in order and he is entitled to reinstatement w.e.f. 18th October, 1975, with continuity of service and full back wages.

I accordingly answer the reference while returning the award in these terms.

Dated, the 7th April, 1977.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

No. 746, dated 18th April, 1977

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

The 5th May, 1977

No. 3939-4Lab.-77/11012.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Rhinko Fibre (P) Ltd., Bahadurgarh.

BEFORE SHRI MOHAN LAL JAIN, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA,
ROHTAK

Reference No. 88 of 1975

between

SHRI AHMED RAZA WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S RHINKO FIBRE
(P) LTD., BHADURGARH
AWARD

By order No. ID/RTK/75/64322, dated 16th October, 1975, the Governor of Haryana, referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. Rhinko Fibre(P) Ltd., Bahadurgarh and its workman Shri Ahmed Raza to this Court, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Ahmed Raza was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

The parties put in their appearance in this Court in response to the usual notices of reference and filed their pleadings.

The workman alleged,—*vide* claim statement filed by him in conformity with the notice of demand, dated 21st May, 1975 served by him on the management, that his services as a supervisor on wages of Rs. 400 P.M. had been illegally terminated by the management concerned without holding a domestic enquiry and giving him an opportunity to meet the Charge-sheet, dated 11th May, 1975 served on him and that he was thus entitled to reinstatement with continuity of service and full back wages.

The management concerned while pleading that Shri Ahmed Raza had been employed in a managerial capacity and as such was not a workman as defined in section 2(s) of the Industrial Disputes Act, denied his allegations,—*vide* written statement filed by them, that the orders of termination of his services were illegal. They stated that Shri Ahmed Raza behaved in an irresponsible manner by creating labour troubles and instigating workers to disobey the orders of Works Incharge and to give lesser output. They set up a case that he insulted the Managing Director of the Company for not granting him loan and that his services were thus rightly terminated on these grounds constituting misconduct rendering him liable to the action taken against him.

Shri Ahmed Raza declined to file the rejoinder and the following issues were thus framed on pleas of the parties,—*vide* my order, dated 30th January, 1975:—

1. Whether Shri Ahmed Raza was not a workman as defined under Section 2(s) of the Industrial Disputes Act?
2. Whether the termination of services of Shri Ahmed Raza was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

I have carefully gone through the written arguments submitted by the parties and seen the records. I decide the issues as under :—

Issue No. 1.

Shri Nirmal Bose, Managing Director of the management concerned examined as MW I admitted that Shri Ahmed Raza was employed as a temporary supervisor on wages of Rs. 400 P.M.—*vide* appointment letter, dated 4th November, 1974, copy Exhibit M-1 and that his duties as such were to give production in full capacity, allot the work to the workmen and to keep accounts of the raw material taken from the stock room. He admitted that Shri Ahmed Raza used to prepare bills of wages of other workmen and mark their attendance in the attendance register.

The aforesaid broad admissions thus made by Shri Nirmal Bose well bring Shri Ahmed Raza within the scope of definition of workman as given in section 2(s) of the Industrial Disputes Act as under :—

“Workman” means any person (including an apprentice) employed in any industry to do any skilled or unskilled manual supervisory, technical or clerical work for hire or reward, whether the terms of employment be express or implied and for the purposes of any proceeding under this Act in relation to an industrial dispute, includes any such person who has been dismissed, discharged or retrenched in connection with, or as a consequence of, that dispute or whose dismissal, discharge or retrenchment has led to that dispute ; but does not include any such person —

(i) X X X

(ii) X X X

(iii) who is employed mainly in a managerial or administrative capacity ; or

(iv) who being employed in a supervisory capacity, draws wages exceeding five hundred rupees per mensem or exercises, either by the nature of the duties attached to the office or by reason of the powers vested in him, functions mainly of a managerial nature.

I thus in view of my findings decide this issue against the management.

Issue No. 2.

It stands conceded that the management did not hold an enquiry into the charge sheet, dated 11th May, 1975 copy Exhibit M-2 served by them on the workman with the allegations that he had been creating labour troubles and misbehaved with the management and instigated the workmen to disobey the order of Works Incharge and committed theft. The management however, led evidence in this Court to prove the charges levelled against the workman. They in this connection examined Shri Nirmal Bose their Managing Director and Shri Shyam Lal Bose, Works Incharge. Shri Nirmal Bose deposed that Shri Ahmed Raza misbehaved with him in presence of Sarvshri Hari Chand, Ramesh and Bhup Singh and stopped these three workmen from continuing in service and forced them to leave their jobs. He added that Shri Ahmed Raza abused him on his (Nirmal Bose) taking a decision that a certain day when work could not be started on account of power shortage would be considered as a close day and no wages would be paid to the workmen for that date and that he (Ahmed Raza) instigated workmen outside his office to make all efforts to get the factory closed. Shri Shyam Lal Bose, Works Incharge corroborated the statement of Shri Nirmal Bose while stating that the latter was abused by Shri Ahmed Raza in his presence with a threat that he (Nirmal Bose) would be taught a lesson and that he (Ahmed Raza) instigated the workmen to get the factory closed.

The workman concerned examined Shri Bhup Singh besides making his own statement and led no evidence. It would be however, interesting to note that Shri Ahmed Raza workman concerned did not even make a denial of the allegations of the management concerned and the statements of Shri Nirmal Bose and Shyam Lal Bose that he abused Shri Nirmal Bose and misbehaved with him and instigated the workmen to make all efforts to get the factory closed. The evidence of Sarvshri Nirmal Bose and Shyam Lal Bose thus remained un rebutted, so much so even Shri Ahmed Raza did not dare to controvert their statements. Whereas Shri Ahmed Raza merely deposed that the management felt aggrieved against him and served him with Charge Sheet only because the demand served on them by their workmen was not withdrawn. Shri Bhup Singh gave out that he declined to appear as a witness against Ahmed Raza on being asked to do so by the management. It would appear that such oral statements are by no means sufficient to rebut the evidence of Sarvshri Nirmal Bose and Shyam Lal Bose in the matter of Charge Sheet referred to above. I agree with the management, that they could not be expected to examine Sarvshri Hari Chand, Ramesh and Bhup Singh workmen who had already abandoned their jobs, in support of the charges levelled against the workman concerned.

Be as it may, I do not see any reason to disbelieve Sarvshri Nirmal Bose and Shyam Lal Bose particularly when no sufficient motive could be suggested by the workman for their deposing against him and considered from any angle their evidence inspires full confidence. I, therefore, relying on their evidence hold that the workman

concerned abused Shri Nirmal Bose and instigated the other workmen to abandon their jobs and to make all efforts to get the factory closed and this constituted a grave misconduct rendering him liable to dismissal and he is not entitled to any relief.

I, thus decide this issue in favour of the management and return the award with the findings stated above.

Dated the 14th April, 1977.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

No. 753, dated 20th April, 1977.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

No. 3937-4Lab-77/11099.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Hindustan National Glass Ltd., Bahadurgarh :—

BEFORE SHRI MOHAN LAL JAIN, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA,
ROHTAK

Reference No. 1 of 1975

between

SHRI RAM SINGH, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S HINDUSTAN
NATIONAL GLASS LTD., BAHADURGARH

AWARD

By order No. ID/RK/13-E-74/471-75, dated 1st January, 1975, the Governor of Haryana, referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Hindustan National Glass Ltd., Bahadurgarh and its workman Shri Ram Singh, to this Court, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

“Whether the termination of services of Shri Ram Singh was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?”

The parties put in their appearance in this Court in response to the usual notices of reference sent to them and filed their pleadings.

The workman alleged,—vide claim statement filed by him in conformity with the notice of demand, dated 27th March, 1974, served by him on the management, that his services as a Fitter on wages of Rs 210 per month had been terminated by the management illegally with effect from 24th December, 1973 and that he was thus entitled to reinstatement with continuity of service and full back wages. He stated that he remained on leave with prior permission of the management concerned, during the period from July, 1973 to 23rd December, 1973 and that the latter declined to accept him on duty on 24th December, 1973, on his reporting to them for that purpose and that they finally informed him verbally on 25th March, 1974, that he had been dismissed from service long back.

The management,—vide written statement filed by them raised a preliminary objection that the reference made to this Court was illegal and unmaintainable for want of service on them of a notice of demand by the workman directly before his approaching the Conciliation Officer for his reinstatement. On facts they admitted hri Ram Singh to be their workman on wages of Rs 210 per month and his having gone on leave from 12th October, 1973 to 22nd December, 1973. They set up a story that he over-stayed for the period from 23rd December, 1973 to 31st December, 1973, his sanctioned leave and thus lost his lien on his job under their Certified Standing Orders applicable to him. They denied the allegations of the workman that he approached them for resuming duty on 24th December, 1973.

The workman reiterated the allegations made by him in the claim statement while controverting the pleas of the management with the result that the following issues were framed by me on pleas of the parties,—*vide* my order dated 2nd September, 1975 :—

- (1) Whether a demand was raised on the management by the workman and rejected by the former before the matter was taken up for Conciliation ?
- (2) Whether the workman was not permitted to join his duty on 24th December, 1973 on his making an offer for the same, after the expiry of his leave on 23rd December, 1973 ?
- (3) Whether the workman absented himself from duty from 24th December, 1973 to 31st December, 1973 without grant of leave by the management or notice of his intention in that connection to the latter on expiry of his leave on 23rd December, 1973 ?
- (4) Whether the termination of his services/dismissal of the workman was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

I have heard Shri Ram Singh workman and Shri S.C. Govil authorised representative for the management with reference to the evidence led by the parties and decide the issues as under :—

Issue No. 1.—The workman did not adduce any evidence in support of this issue. He thus failed to establish on a question of fact, that he raised a demand directly on the management and the latter rejected it before his approaching the Conciliation Officer for redress of his grievances. This is however, not sufficient to reject the reference as maintainable, in view of my findings made,—*vide* order, dated 10th January, 1975 in reference titled Shri S.C. Sethi *versus* Kirlosker Oil Engine, pending in the Industrial Tribunal that it was no longer necessary for the workman to raise a demand directly on the management and for the latter to reject it before his taking the matter to the Conciliation Officer, in order to constitute an Industrial Dispute. I, thus decide this issue accordingly.

Issue Nos. 2 and 3.—These issues being interconnected shall be disposed of and decided by me together. The workman Shri Ram Singh appearing as his own witness as WW-1 fully supported his case and examined Sarvshri Narain Singh and Kartar Singh who both corroborated him. He denied a suggestion made by the management that he declined to receive letter sent to him by them. He admitted that he did not appear before the Labour Inspector on the date of hearing fixed by him in the matter of his complaint to pursue the same. Shri Narain Singh deposed that he accompanied Shri Ram Singh to the main gate of the factory where he had gone to resume his duty and that in his presence the watchman on duty declined permission of his entry and that Shri S.C. Govil called there by the watchman told Shri Ram Singh that he would inform him about the decision of the management to take him on duty 2 or 3 days after consulting the management. Shri Kartar Singh merely gave out that Shri Ram Singh workman told him in or about the last week of December, 1973 about Shri S.C. Govil having asked him to come 3 or 4 days after for hearing the decision of the management in the matter of their readiness to take him on duty and that Shri Ram Singh told him 3 or 4 days thereafter that they declined to take him on duty. This all the evidence led by the workman in support of his allegations.

As against the aforesaid evidence produced by the workman, the management examined Shri S.C. Govil their Personnel Officer as MW-1 and Shri D.N. Sharma their Incharge Time Office as MW-2 who both supported their case. Shri S.C. Govil stated that Shri Ram Singh availed leave for the period from 12th October, 1973 to 22nd December, 1973 and did not attend his duties thereafter and that he thus overstayed after the expiry of his leave on 22nd December, 1973 and lost his lien on the job held by him under the relevant Certified Standing Orders copy Ex. M-1. He added that the management sent to him letter copy Ex. M-2 through registered post on both the addresses supplied by him and that whereas one of the registered envelope was received back with endorsement of the Postman concerned of his refusal to receive the same, the other registered envelope was received with endorsement of the addresses being not available and his house being locked. The management actually brought on record the registered envelopes M-3 and M-4 bearing the aforesaid reports of the official concerned of the Post Office and those envelopes when opened, were found to contain letters dated 1st January, 1974 copy Ex. M-2, informing Shri Ram Singh that he had overstayed his sanctioned leave thus losing his lien on the job under Standing Orders 17 (b) of their Certified Standing Orders and that he could collect his dues from them.

Shri D.N. Sharma, Incharge Time Office deposed with reference to the muster-roll of the year 1973 of the workman brought by him in Court, that Shri Ram Singh was recorded as being on leave from 12th October, 1973 to 22nd December, 1973 and absented from 23rd December, 1973 till 1st April, 1974 and that these entries, in the muster-roll were made by him in his own handwriting. He added that the Conciliation Officer came to the factory and inspected these entries on a complaint made by Shri Ram Singh and signed the same on 13th June, 1974 and that he (D.N. Sharma) recorded a note, dated 1st January, 1974 on the muster-roll about Shri Ram Singh having lost his lien on the job due to his overstay. He continued to say that the letters Ex. M-5 and M-2 sent to the workman informing him about his overstay and loss of his lien on the job were processed by him.

It would thus appear that there is overwhelming evidence oral and documentary on record in support of the plea of the management that Shri Ram Singh, workman in fact overstayed his sanctioned leave and on his failure to attend his duties from 24th December, 1973 to 1st January, 1974, his name was struck off the rolls as a result of loss of his lien on the job held by him under Certified Standing Orders 17-(b) copy Ex. M-1. Nothing could be brought out in cross examination of Sarvshri S.C. Govil and Shri D.N. Sharma leading me to suspect their statements or the documents relied on by them. In absence of any material on record, in that direction it cannot be said that they fabricated all these documents or colluded, with the Postman concerned in obtaining a report on the registered envelope Ex. M-3 about the refusal of Shri Ram Singh to receive the same. I am under the circumstances constrained to hold that the reports made by the Postman on the envelope Ex. M-3 about the refusal of the workman to receive the same and on the envelope Ex. M-4 about his being not available and his house being locked are correct in all respects and lead to a conclusion beyond doubt that he avoided to receive any information or letter of the management under his signatures only in order to take dishonest plea subsequently to make illegal gains. The admitted circumstance that the workman failed to pursue the complaint made by him before the Labour Inspector and absented himself on the date of hearing fixed in the case, lends sufficient corroboration to the conclusion already arrived at by me and the allegations made by him before me are false and fabricated. No explanation could be given by the workman of his absence before the Labour Inspector on the date of hearing fixed in the case and his failure to pursue the same and the result is that the complaint made by him was itself a fabrication.

The workman did not indicate any motive of the management either in the notice of demand or in the claim statement for victimising him. It was for the first time in his statement made by him as his own witness on 6th April, 1976 that he gave out that he had appeared as a witness against the management in three cases and they nursed a grudge against him on account of his Trade Union activities. This solitary bare statement made by him as late as on 6th April, 1976 is obviously an after thought liable to be rejected as a made up story on this ground alone. Even otherwise the workman could not corroborate this statement by documentary evidence and the oral testimony of Shri Narain Singh WW-2 that Shri Ram Singh appeared as a witness in his favour in complaints filed by him against the management under section 506/193 I.P.C., in absence of documentary evidence can hardly be relied upon. Taken from any angle the evidence led by the management is reliable and the one relied upon by the workman is liable to be rejected as false for the reasons stated above in detail.

The workman had nothing to say against the Certified Standing Orders No. 17-(b) copy Ex. M-1 and he shall be deemed to have lost his lien on the job thereunder, as a result of a finding of fact made by me that he overstayed for 10 days his sanctioned leave. I, thus relying on the evidence, documentary and oral adduced by the management decide issue No. 2 against the workman and issue No. 3 in favour of the management.

Issue No. 4.—In view of my findings on Issues No. 2 and 3 this is obviously not a case of termination of services of the workman by the management and is on the other hand a case of loss of lien on the job held by him as he is not entitled to any relief. I decide this issue accordingly.

I, thus return the award with the finding as stated above.

Dated the 14th April, 1977.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak.

No. 755, dated the 20th April, 1977

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under Section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak.

No. 3940-4Lab-77/11101.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s. Phinko Fibre (P) Ltd., Bahadurgarh.

BEFORE SHRI MOHAN LAL JAIN, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA,
ROHTAK

Reference No. 89 of 1975

between

SHRI ZILE SINGH, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. RHINKO FIBRE (P)
LTD., BAHADURGARH

AWARD

By Order No. ID/RTK/330-D-75/64294, dated 16th October, 1975, the Governor of Haryana, referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. Rhinko Fibre (P) Ltd., Modern Industrial Estate, Bahadurgarh, and its workman Shri Zile Singh to this Court, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Whether the termination of services of Shri Zile Singh was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

The parties put in their appearance in this Court in response to the usual notices of reference sent to them and filed their pleadings.

The workman alleged,—*vide* claim statement filed by him in conformity with the notice of demand dated 23rd May, 1975, served by him on the management, that his services had been terminated illegally by the management on 23rd May, 1975, when he was not permitted to work in the factory and that he was thus entitled to reinstatement with full back wages and continuity of service. He stated that he was working as Chowkidar since 1st January, 1974, on wages of Rs 175 per mensem and that he was called by the management on 22nd May, 1975, in their office and was forced to sign blank papers and Vouchers in the presence of Sarvshri Bhup Singh and Hari Chand coworkers and that he sent a complaint to S.H.O., Police Station, Bahadurgarh, on the next date after he had refused to record his report on a request made by him orally.

The management,—*vide* written statement filed by them denied the allegations of the workman and pleaded that his services were never terminated by them and that he was not a workman as and such reference made to this Court was illegal.

The workman declined to file the rejoinder and the following issues were framed,—*vide* my order dated 30th January, 1976 :—

- (1) Whether Shri Zile Singh was not a workman as defined under section 2 (s) of the Industrial Disputes Act ?
- (2) Whether the termination of services of Shri Zile Singh was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

I have heard the parties with reference to the evidence led by them. I decide the issues as under :—

Issue No. 1

The management admitted that Shri Zile Singh had been employed with them as a Watchman. They led no evidence to show that he was not a workman within the definition of this term as given in section 2 (s) of the Industrial Disputes Act. In view of the admitted fact that Shri Zile Singh was employed as a Watchman on wages of Rs 175 per mensem he is obviously a workman within the aforesaid definition. Even otherwise the plea covered by this issue was not pressed by the management during arguments and as such I decide the same against them.

Issue No. 2

The management in order to prove this issue examined their Managing Director Shri Nirmal Bose who deposed that Shri Zile Singh workman concerned resigned his job,—*vide* resignation dated 22nd May, 1975, written and signed by him in his own hand writing in his presence voluntarily without any force or influence being exercised on him, and that he received a sum of Rs 215 on the same day in full and final settlement of all his claims,—*vide* Voucher duly signed by him in his presence. The witness supported his statement by production of the original resignation and voucher brought by him in court, for inspection of the opposite party.

The workman concerned while admitting the original resignation to be in his hand writing and under his signatures explained that the same had been obtained from him by Shri Bimal Bose and some other officer of the management by force in the presence of Shri Bhup Singh after he declined to appear as a witness against Raza Ahmed, in an enquiry held against the latter. He stated that the resignation was obtained from him under threat of an attack on him with a knife held by Shri Bimal Bose and that he lodged a report in the Police Station copy where of was, Exhibit W-1. This is all the evidence led by the workman in support of his plea.

It is significant to note, that no such suggestion was ever made to Shri Nirmal Bose in cross examination in respect of the plea of the workman that the resignation copy Exhibit M-1 was obtained from him by the former and Bimal Bose under threat or coercion and that Shri Bhup Singh the only other witness examined by the workman, was not asked a single question in this connection, even though it was specifically alleged in the claim statement and in the complaint, EW/1 that Sarvshri Bhup Singh and Hari Chand, Co-workmen, were present at the time of Shri Nirmal Bose and Bimal Bose obtaining the resignation by force. Shri Hari Chand was not ever examined.

The workman did not make any attempt to call the actual report alleged to have been sent by him to S.H.O. Police Station, Bahadurgarh by registered post and a copy thereof Exhibit W-1 produced by him without summoning the original, is no proof of his having lodged a report. All the circumstances unmistakably lead to a conclusion beyond doubt that the story in respect of the management having obtained his resignation by force is all a myth and a concoction fabricated to make an unlawful gain and deserves to be rejected as false.

Nothing on the other hand could be brought in cross examination of Shri Nirmal Bose leading me to suspect his evidence and taken from any angle there is nothing on record justifying the rejection of his statement as unreliable particularly when the workman admitted the resignation to be in his own hand writing and under his signatures and the voucher copy M-2 put under his signatures and the story put forth by him had been rejected by me as false. I thus, relying on the statement of Shri Nirmal Bose hold that the workman abandoned his job voluntarily vide resignation copy Exhibit M-1 and received a sum of Rs. 225 vide voucher Exhibit M-2 without any force or coercion being exercised on him and that this is not a case of the termination of services by the management.

I decide this issue accordingly with the result that the workman is not entitled to any relief I thus return the award with these findings.

Dated the 14th April, 1977.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

No. 754, dated 20th April, 1977.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Dated the 14th April, 1977.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

The 12th April, 1977

No. 1873-3Lab-77/8864.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 7 of the Minimum Wages Act, 1948) (Central Act 11 of 1948) and all other powers enabling him in this behalf, the Governor of Haryana hereby appoints Minimum Wages Advisory Board consisting of the following members, including the Chairman, for the purpose of co-ordinating the work of committees appointed under the said Act and advising the State Government of Haryana generally in the matter of fixing and revising minimum rates of wages for the employees in the Scheduled employments :—

GOVERNMENT NOMINEES

- | | |
|--|-------------|
| 1. Financial Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Department | .. Chairman |
| 2. Labour Commissioner, Haryana | .. Member |
| 3. Director of Industries, Haryana | .. Member |
| 4. Economic and Statistical Adviser, Haryana | .. Member |
| 5. Chief Engineer, P.W.D. (B & R) Haryana | .. Member |

EMPLOYERS' REPRESENTATIVES

- | | |
|---|-----------|
| 1. President, Haryana Pradesh Chambers of Commerce and Industries, E-23, Industrial Area, Yamunanagar | .. Member |
| 2. President, Punjab, Haryana and Delhi Chamber of Commerce and Industries A, Canaught Place, New Delhi | .. Member |
| 3. President, Chamber of Commerce and Industries, Yamunanagar | .. Member |
| 4. President, Faridabad Industries Association, Faridabad | .. Member |
| 5. President, Yamuna Nagar Industries Association, Industrial Area, Yamunanagar | .. Member |

EMPLOYEES REPRESENTATIVES

- | | |
|---|-----------|
| 1. President, Indian National Trade Union Congress, Haryana Yamunanagar | .. Member |
| 2. President, Haryana State Committee, All India Trade Union Congress, Panipat | .. Member |
| 3. Shri Jai Gopal Sharma, E-57, Industrial Area, Yamunanagar | .. Member |
| 4. Shri R.D. Shastri, Vice President, Indian National Trade Union Congress, Sonapat | .. Member |
| 5. President Haryana Roadways Workers, Union Ambala City | .. Member |

The headquarters of the Advisory Board will be at Chandigarh. The meeting of the Board may be held at the Headquarters or at any other place in the State of Haryana at the discretion of the Chairman.

The term of the Board will be for a period of the years from the date of publication of this notification in the Official Gazette.

P.P. CAPRIHAN,

Financial Commissioner and Secy.

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT

The 11th May, 1977

No. Spl. Agri. II(2)-77/7809.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of article 99 and article 100 of the Articles of Association of the Haryana Agro-Industries Corporation Limited, and all other powers enabling him in this behalf, the President of India is pleased to remove Shri Ram Narain Singh, I.A.S., (Retired) from the office of the Chairman-cum-Managing Director of the Haryana Agro Industries Corporation Ltd., with immediate effect and to appoint Shri G.L. Bailur as Part-time Chairman and Shri A.C. Sharma, Additional Director, Agriculture and Managing Director of the said Corporation in addition to his present duties.

G. L. BAILUR, Secy,

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

BUILDINGS AND ROADS BRANCH

The 10th May, 1977

No. 3821-PW-III(5)-77/14094.—The President of India is pleased to declare the following Assistant Engineers/Sub-Divisional Engineers (Civil) of the P.W.D., B. & R. Branch as successful candidates in the Departmental Professional Examination held from 28th December, 1976 to 30th December, 1976:—

Serial No.	Name
	S/Shri—
1	Arvind Krishan, S.D.E.
2	H.L. Grover, S.D.E.
3	J.S. Sahsi, S.D.E.
4	C.B. Panwar, S.D.E.
5	G.K. Sethi, S.D.E.
6	P.N. Wadhwa, S.D.E.
7	S.C. Chhabra, S.D.E.
8	Madan Lal, S.D.E.
9	A.K. Madkan, S.D.E.
10	B. N. Taneja, S.D.E.

2. The President of India is also pleased to grant exemption to the following Assistant Engineers/Sub-Divisional Engineers (Civil) in the papers mentioned against their names as these have obtained more than 60 per cent marks in these papers in the Departmental Professional Examination held from 28th December, 1976 to 30th December, 1976 :—

Serial No.	Name	Subject
	S/Shri—	
1	Sarv Mittar Parkash, S.D.E.	.. Material and Construction/Simple Elect. and Mech. Engg.
2	D.K. Arora, S.D.E.	.. Material and Construction/Roads and Bridges/water supply and Drainage General oral.

Serial No.	Name	Subject
S/Shri—		
3	Pritam Singh, S.D.E.	.. Material and construction/Simple Elect. and Mech. Engg./General oral
4	H.K. Sharma, S.D.E.	.. Material and construction/water supply and drainage/Simple Elect. and Mech. Engg.
5	Pushpinder Kumar Kochar, S.D.E.,	Material and construction/water supply and Drainage/Accounts and office procedure
6	Jagdish Mittar	} Accounts and Office Procedure
7	Yoginder Pal Arora	
8	Ram Pal Singh	
9	O.P. Gupta, S.D.E.	.. Roads and Bridges
10	G.P. Lathar, S.D.E.	.. Roads and Bridges/General Oral.
11	M.M. Bhatia	} S.D.Es. Water supply and Drainage
12	S.L. Vijn	
13	R.P. Panderuwala	
14	Dharam Singh Jaglan	
15	Sham Lal Gupta	
16	M.P. Singh	}
17	Surat Singh	
18	L.P. Verma, S.D.E.	Simple Elect. and Mech. Engg.

SUKHDEV PARSAD, Secy.

IRRIGATION DEPARTMENT

The 7th May, 1977

No. 6045/2-L.—Whereas it appears to the Governor of Haryana, that land specified below is needed by the Government at public expense, for a public purpose, namely for the Additional land to be acquired for the construction of Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru Feeder from R.D. 0—30,000 off taking at R.D. 145,210 Right Delhi Parallel Branch in villages Sardhana, Teori, Bajana Khurd, Bajana Kalan in tehsil and district Sonapat and villages Kasendhi, Kasendah, Saragthal in tehsil Gohana, district Sonapat, it is hereby notified that the land in the locality specified below is to be required for the above purpose

This notification is made under the provision of section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, for the information of all to whom it may concern.

In exercise of the powers conferred by the aforesaid section, the Governor of Haryana hereby authorised the officers of Irrigation Department for the time being engaged in the undertaking alongwith their servants, and workmen etc. to enter upon and survey land in the locality and do all other acts required for permitted by the Section.

Further, whereas the Governor of Haryana is satisfied that the land is required for the above work which is of very importance within the meaning of clause (C) of sub-section (2) of section 17 of the said Act and whereas the Governor of Haryana is of the opinion that the provisions of sub-section (2) of the said section are thus applicable, it is hereby directed under sub-section (4) of section 17 of the said Act that the provision of section 5-A of the said Act shall not apply in regard to this acquisition.

This superseeds notification No. 14905/1-L, dated 13th December, 1976 published in the Haryana Government Gazette, dated 28th December, 1976.

District	Tehsil	Village Area	Hadbast Number	Field No.		
Sonapat	Sonapat	Sardhana, 1.67 acres	123	7	8	9
				19, 21, 22 9	1, 10, 11	5, 6, 13, 14, 15, 16 22
				17, 23, 24, 25 22	3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 18	
				19, 20, 21, 22, 23 25		
				1, 2, 9, 10, 11, 12, 20, 21 26		
				6, 15/1, 15/2, 16, 17, 24, 25 37		
				3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 12, 13, 14, 17, 18, 19, 22, 23, 44		
				1, 2, 3, 9, 10, 11, 12, 19, 20, 21 45		
				15, 16, 25 56	55	
				1, 10	4, 5, 6, 7, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 23, 24, 25 61	
				3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23 70		
				1, 2/1, 2/2, 9, 10, 11/1, 11/2, 12 69		
				6, 15		
Do	Do	Teori, 16.87 acres	127		7	
				14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25 22	21	
				1, 2, 3, 4, 9, 10, 11 21	5, 6, 7, 12, 15, 16	
				13, 14, 17, 18, 19, 20/2, 21, 22, 23 20	26	
				25	1, 2, 10 27	
				3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11/2, 12, 13, 14, 18, 19, 20 27	28	
				21, 22	16, 17, 23, 24, 26 37	
				2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 20		

District	Tehsil	Village Area	Hadbast Number	Field No.
Sonepat	Sonepat	Teori, 16.87 acres— concl'd	127— concl'd	<p>36</p> <hr/> <p>14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 23, 24, 25,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">47</p> <hr/> <p>2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 19, 20/1, 20/2, 21</p> <p style="text-align: center;">48 54</p> <hr/> <p>15/2, 16/2, 4, 25,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">53 1</p> <hr/> <p>3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23</p> <p style="text-align: center;">52 65</p> <hr/> <p>25, 1, 2, 10</p> <p style="text-align: center;">66</p> <hr/> <p>4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21</p> <p style="text-align: center;">66 67</p> <hr/> <p>22, 23,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">25</p>
Do	Do	Bajana Khurd, 1.61 acres	125	<p>95</p> <hr/> <p>19, 20, 21, 22</p> <p style="text-align: center;">102</p> <hr/> <p>3, 4, 5, 6, 7</p> <p style="text-align: center;">96</p> <hr/> <p>24, 25</p> <p style="text-align: center;">103</p> <hr/> <p>1, 2, 10</p>
Do	Do	Bajana Kalan, 16.69 acres	126	<p>64</p> <hr/> <p>3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 20</p> <p style="text-align: center;">63</p> <hr/> <p>6, 7, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23</p> <p style="text-align: center;">62</p> <hr/> <p>16, 17, 18, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25</p> <p style="text-align: center;">61 70 71</p> <hr/> <p>25, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6/1, 6/2</p> <p style="text-align: center;">71</p> <hr/> <p>7, 8, 9, 10, 11/1, 11/2, 12, 13, 14</p> <p style="text-align: center;">72</p> <hr/> <p>6, 7, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23</p> <p style="text-align: center;">73</p> <hr/> <p>16, 17/1, 17/2, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25</p> <p style="text-align: center;">82 74</p> <hr/> <p>1, 2, 3, 4,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">81 24, 25</p> <hr/> <p>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 20</p> <p style="text-align: center;">80</p> <hr/> <p>6, 7, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24</p> <p style="text-align: center;">99 100</p> <hr/> <p>1, 2, 3, 9, 10, 11</p> <p style="text-align: center;">5, 6, 14, 15, 16, 17, 23, 24, 25</p>

District	Tehsil	Village Area	Hadbast Number	Field Nos.
Sonepat	Gohana	Kasendhi 11.06 acres	59	77 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12/1, 12/2, 13, 18, 19, 20, 21/1 77 80 21/2, 22 5, 6/1, 6/2, 14, 15, 16, 17, 23 80 81 24, 25 1, 2, 10, 11, 20 89 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 18, 19, 20, 21, 89 91 2/1 22/2, 23 1, 2, 9, 10, 11, 20 92 5, 6, 14, 15/1, 15/2, 16/1, 16/2, 17, 18/2, 22, 92 98 23, 24, 25 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 97 6, 7, 8/1, 8/2, 11, 12, 13/1, 13/2, 14, 15, 17, 18, 97 19, 20 3 19, 20/1, 20/2, 21, 22 2 9 16, 17, 24, 25 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11 10 6, 7, 8/1, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 10 11 20, 21, 22 16, 17/2, 22, 23, 24, 25 20 1/1, 1/2, 2/1, 2/2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9/1, 9/2, 10, 11 19 5/2, 6, 7/1, 7/2, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19/1 16 18 19/2, 20, 21, 22 16, 17, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25 35 36 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 9, 10 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 17 4.47 Acres 21/1, 21/2, 22/1, 22/2, 23, 24, 25/1, 25/2 16 21, 22/2, 23/2, 24/2, 25/2 37 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 68 67 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8
Sonepat	Gohana	Saragthal 4.47 Acres	60	3 19, 20/1, 20/2, 21, 22 2 9 16, 17, 24, 25 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11 10 6, 7, 8/1, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 10 11 20, 21, 22 16, 17/2, 22, 23, 24, 25 20 1/1, 1/2, 2/1, 2/2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9/1, 9/2, 10, 11 19 5/2, 6, 7/1, 7/2, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19/1 16 18 19/2, 20, 21, 22 16, 17, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25 35 36 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 9, 10 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 17 4.47 Acres 21/1, 21/2, 22/1, 22/2, 23, 24, 25/1, 25/2 16 21, 22/2, 23/2, 24/2, 25/2 37 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 68 67 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8
Do	Gohana	Kasendhan 0.62 Acres	58	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 68 67 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8
Total	..	52.99 Acres		